

169780

**STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
REGION V**

**DATE:** April 7, 1998

**SUBJECT:** ARCS WACR Evaluation Needed for  
WA # 47, Sauget Area 1 & 2  
ARCS - Ecology & Environment, Inc.

**FROM:** Steve Nathan *SA*  
ARCS PO

**TO:** Leah Evison, (SR-6J)  
ARCS WAM

Attached is 1) a summary of the LOE and ratings provided by the WAM of record during every rating period since the subject work assignment was issued and 2) a copy of the contractor's WACR evaluation. This is being provided to aid you in preparing your WACR evaluation for the subject work assignment which is due April 14, 1998. Please provide both a hard copy and an electronic copy of the WACR. A copy of the WACR evaluation form can be found in the following subdirectory:

G:\USER\SHARE\CONTRACT\EVAL\EVALUATE.E&E

Reminder: If the LOE incurred during this rating period is greater than the minimum thresholds identified below, then you will also need to prepare a regular evaluation for the period covering November 1, 1997 to April 30, 1998. The regular evaluation form can be found in the following subdirectory:

TYPE OF WORK ASSIGNMENT	MINIMUM LOE THRESHOLD
Fund-Lead Projects	80 LOE
Oversight Projects	40 LOE
Community Relations	20 LOE

If you have any questions, please contact me at 6-5496.

Attachments

cc: S. Averill, w/o attachments (P-19J)

## E&amp;E - ARCS WACR Evaluation Worksheet Performance Period 22

Work Work Assignment Number	Site Name	Rating Period	LOE	Rating	Weighted Average	Comments	
47	SAUGET AREA 1 & 2 TA	1			0.0000		
		2			0.0000		
		3			0.0000		
		4			0.0000		
		5			0.0000		
		6			0.0000		
		7			0.0000		
		8			0.0000		
		9			0.0000		
		10			0.0000		
		11			0.0000		
		12			0.0000		
		13			0.0000		
		14			0.0000		
		15			0.0000		
		16			0.0000		
		17			0.0000		
		18			0.0000		
		19			0.0000		
		20			0.0000		
		21		4,550.00		0.0000	
		22				0.0000	
		23				0.0000	
			4,550.00		0.0000		



## **ecology and environment, inc.**

International Specialists in the Environment

---

33 North Dearborn Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60602  
Tel. 312/578-9243, Fax: 312/578-9345

March 26, 1998

Mr. Steve Nathan (SM-5J)  
ARCS 5 Project Officer  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Contracts Management Section  
77 West Jackson Blvd.  
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Re: Work Assignment Completion Report for Sauget Area 1 & 2 Technical  
Assistance, WA No. 47-5N60.

Dear Mr. Nathan:

As instructed by WA No. 47-5N60, Revision No. 5 dated March 10, 1998 for the Sauget Area 1 & 2 Technical Assistance work assignment, E & E has prepared the attached Work Assignment Completion Report (WACR). As specified by the subject revision, all file information for this assignment was submitted to the EPA Records Center.

Should you have any questions concerning this submittal, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



ECOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT, INC.

Daniel T. Sewall  
ARCS Program Manager

Attachment

cc: P. Hendrixson, EPA CO  
L. Evison, EPA WAM  
C. Carlson, E & E PM

### EPA WORK ASSIGNMENT COMPLETION REPORT (WACR)

<b>Contract Number:</b> <b>68-W8-0086</b>	<b>Work Assignment Number:</b> 47-5N60	<b>EPA Region:</b> 5
<b>Contractor/Subcontractor(s):</b>  Ecology and Environment, Inc.	<b>Site Manager (and Phone Number):</b> [REDACTED]	
	<b>RPM (and Phone Number):</b> Leah Evison - (312) 886-4696	
	<b>Site Name and Location:</b> Sauget Area 1 & 2 Sites, St. Clair Co., Illinois	
<b>Briefly Describe Scope of Work:</b> <i>(Additional pages may be attached if necessary)</i>  Conduct technical assistance tasks for the Sauget Area 1 & 2 Sites, including: preparation of planning documents including a work plan and a subsequent work plan revision, reviewing state and federal file information for pertinent technical data and PRP related information, conducting a property ownership search at the county assessor's office, compiling property ownership maps and tables, compiling all technical data into summary table format and presenting the data in tables and figures, compiling all PRP related information into a database and organizing PRP-related files, preparing a memorandum on data gaps for the Sauget Area sites, and researching and documenting historical property ownership information for Site N within the Sauget Area 1 Sites.		
<b>Describe Contractor's Performance:</b> <i>(Additional pages may be attached if necessary)</i>  In order to complete the work assignment tasks, E & E's initial task was to review more than 100,000 paper copies of file information plus approximately 75,000 pages of file information on microfiche. From this information, E & E copied and retained more than 10,000 paper copies and 700 microfiche (approximately 35,000 pages of information) for inclusion in the project files. E & E condensed this information and compiled data for greater than 1,000 environmental samples collected over the past 20 years. In addition, this file information was condensed and provided in a PRP database for the project. These tasks were monumental and required technical commitment and focus from E & E's project team to accomplish the project goals. E & E's project team demonstrated a high level of responsiveness, technical competence, and superior commitment to the project. E & E was proactive in recommending reporting options and suggestions for project deliverables during the course of work activities for the project. E & E demonstrated effective use of resources during the duration of the project and maintained costs to a minimum, wherever possible. Overall, E & E's project personnel have provided excellent support to EPA in the completion of this project and in meeting the goals and objectives of the work assignment.		
<b>Phase I Award Fee</b> Available: <u>\$5,342</u> Paid: <u>\$0.00</u>	<b>Phase II Award Fee</b> Available: <u>\$5,342</u> Recommended: <u>90%</u> (0-100%)	
<b>State Specific Reasons for Recommendation for Phase II Award:</b> <i>(Additional pages may be attached if necessary)</i>  E & E's strong performance has supported EPA in meeting project goals and objectives. E & E consistently demonstrated a high level of responsiveness, flexibility, and technical competence on this assignment, and put forth considerable expert technical effort to provide excellent quality work products relating primarily to the summary tables/maps and PRP database deliverables. E & E consistently worked to minimize costs and meet EPA schedules required to achieve the project objectives.		
 _____ (Date)	 _____ Program Manager (Date)	3-26-98 (Date)

**EPA WORK ASSIGNMENT COMPLETION REPORT (WACR)**  
**PART II: PROJECT SCHEDULE AND COST INFORMATION WORKSHEET**

<b>Contract Number: 68-W3-0086</b>		<b>Work Assignment Number: 47-SN60</b>				<b>EPA Region: 5</b>	
<b>Key WA Activities</b>		<b>Planned Costs</b>				<b>Completion Dates</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>LOE Hours</b>	<b>LOE Dollars</b>	<b>Subcontractor Dollars</b>	<b>Total Dollars</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
Initial Work Assignment	07/16/97	100	\$10,000	0	\$10,000	11/97	—
Rev. No. 1—Scope of Work Revision #1	07/25/97	100	\$10,000	0	\$20,000	02/98	—
Rev. No. 2—Work Plan Approval	08/22/97	1,861	\$146,921	0	\$166,921	02/98	—
Rev. No. 3—Work Plan Revision No. 1 Approval	01/30/98	310	\$27,097	0	\$194,018	02/98	—
Rev. No. 4—Increase LOE EL	02/24/98	150	0	0	\$194,018	03/98	—
Rev. No. 5—Work Assignment Close-out Notification	03/10/98	0	0	0	\$194,018	04/98	03/98
<b>TOTAL PLANNED COST</b>		<b>2,521</b>	<b>\$194,018</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$194,018</b>		
<b>TOTAL ACTUAL COST*</b>		<b>2,513.5</b>	<b>\$189,005</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$189,005</b>		
<b>VARIANCE</b>		<b>7.5</b>	<b>\$5,013</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$5,013</b>		

\* The actual cost listed represents LOE and costs incurred through March 21, 1998. The cost does not include estimated remaining Phase I and Phase II award fees or supplemental costs for indirect rate adjustments.

**EPA WORK ASSIGNMENT COMPLETION REPORT (WACR)  
PART III: PERFORMANCE CRITERIA RATING WORKSHEET**

<b>Contract Number: 68-W8-0086</b>		<b>Work Assignment Number: 47-SN60</b>		<b>EPA Region: 5</b>
<b>Performance Criteria</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Supporting Comments</b>		
<b>Project Planning</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organizing (e.g., work plan development, data review)</li> <li>Scheduling</li> <li>Budgeting</li> </ul>	<div style="text-align: right;">             _____ 5              _____ 4  <u>    X    </u> 3              _____ 2              _____ 1           </div>	Project planning documents, including a work plan/budget estimate and work plan revision were all thorough and submitted in a timely manner.		
<b>Technical Competence and Innovation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effectiveness of analyses</li> <li>Meet plan goals</li> <li>Support COE, state, enforcement</li> <li>Adhere to regulations and procedures</li> <li>Approach creativity/ingenuity</li> <li>Expert testimony</li> </ul>	<div style="text-align: right;">             _____ 5  <u>    X    </u> 4              _____ 3              _____ 2              _____ 1           </div>	E & E was quite effective in the analysis of file information and data. The project files were filled with thousands of pages of data which was unusable and numerous samples were reported in separate formats with different sample designations. All this related to extended effort deciphering sample data which otherwise should not have been needed. Effective analysis of the file and excellent project organization allowed for the project goals to be met. E & E was innovative in researching aerial photo sources, and providing property ownership information on photos to EPA rather than on maps. This created a much more effective deliverable.		
<b>Schedule and Cost Control</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Budget (hours and cost) maintenance</li> <li>Priority/schedule adjustments</li> <li>Cost minimization</li> </ul>	<div style="text-align: right;">             _____ 5              _____ 4  <u>    X    </u> 3              _____ 2              _____ 1           </div>	Budget and schedule control were well maintained, given the complexity and extreme magnitude of the project. Cost-saving measures, such as sending out lengthy documents for copying, were implemented where possible. Lower P-grade personnel were extensively used in lengthy tasks such as data entry and graphics in order to best maintain budget control.		
<b>Reporting</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Timeliness of deliverables</li> <li>Clarity</li> <li>Thoroughness</li> </ul>	<div style="text-align: right;">             _____ 5  <u>    X    </u> 4              _____ 3              _____ 2              _____ 1           </div>	Deliverables were submitted in timeframes which were acceptable to the WAM, throughout the project. Deliverables were complete, thorough, and written in a self-explanatory manner. Draft deliverables submitted required little or no changes in order to finalize the documents and/or deliverable. Deliverables were above average in quality and technically sound which will assist EPA greatly in additional phases of work related to the Sauget sites.		
<b>Resource Utilization</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staffing</li> <li>Subcontracting</li> <li>Equipment, travel, etc.</li> </ul>	<div style="text-align: right;">             _____ 5  <u>    X    </u> 4              _____ 3              _____ 2              _____ 1           </div>	The necessary resources were committed throughout the project to achieve schedules and objectives. Technical specialists or just additional staff were assigned to various project tasks in order to meet deliverable schedules. A total of 22 different technical staff members were used to efficiently complete the project tasks.		
<b>Effort</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responsiveness</li> <li>Mobilization</li> <li>Day-to-day</li> <li>Special situations (e.g., adverse/dangerous conditions)</li> </ul>	<div style="text-align: right;">             _____ 5  <u>    X    </u> 4              _____ 3              _____ 2              _____ 1           </div>	E & E's effort throughout the course of this project was excellent. The Site Manager and project team were extremely responsive to the project, and demonstrated competence in completing the difficult project tasks. Effort was always expended to exceed agency expectations, for example: the final work plan was submitted to EPA the same day comments were received. In addition, E & E submitted more than twice the number of project deliverable copies specified in the Scope of Work based upon the WAM's request. These deliverable efforts used considerable time and effort which were not anticipated in budgeting or scheduling.		

5) Outstanding   4) Exceeded Expectations   3) Satisfactory   2) Marginal   1) Unsatisfactory